Asaad K. Siddiqi, Esq. (AS 9150) Walder Hayden P.A. 5 Becker Farm Rd. Roseland, NJ 07068 aksiddiqi@walderhayen.com 973-992-5300

John P. Fuller, Esquire, pro hac vice pending Fuller, Fuller & Associates, P.A. 12000 Biscayne Blvd., Suite 502 North Miami, FL 33181 (305) 891-5199 jpf@fullerfuller.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY CAMDEN DIVISION

DENNIS MAURER, Individually,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
VS.	:	
		Case No.
HPT IHG-2 PROPERTIES TRUST, a Mary	land :	
Corporation,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	
	/	

#### **COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff, DENNIS MAURER, Individually, on his behalf and on behalf of all other mobility impaired individuals similarly situated, (sometimes referred to as "Plaintiff"), hereby sues the Defendant, HPT IHG-2 PROPERTIES TRUST, a Maryland Corporation, (sometimes referred to as "Defendant"), for Injunctive Relief, damages, attorney's fees, litigation expenses, and costs pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq. ("ADA") and the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination (N.J.S.A.).

- Plaintiff, Dennis Maurer, is an individual residing at 8 Prospect Ave, Egg Harbor Township,
   NJ 08234, in the County of Atlantic.
- 2. Defendant, HPT IHG-2 PROPERTIES TRUST, is a Maryland Corporation, which holds title to the subject property alleged by Plaintiff to be operating in violation of Title III of the ADA.
- Defendant's property, Sonesta ES Suites Somers Point, is located at 900 Mays Landing Rd.,
   Somers Point, NJ 08244, in the County of Camden.
- 4. Venue is properly located in the District of New Jersey because venue lies in the judicial district of the property situs. The Defendant's property is located in and does business within this judicial district.
- 5. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 28 U.S.C. § 1343, this Court has been given original jurisdiction over actions which arise from the Defendant's violations of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq. See also 28 U.S.C. § 2201 and § 2202.
- Plaintiff Dennis Maurer is a New Jersey resident, is sui juris, and qualifies as an individual with disabilities as defined by the ADA. Mr. Maurer has multiple sclerosis and is mobility impaired, and uses a wheelchair for mobility. Dennis Maurer has visited the property on February 1, 2016, which forms the basis of this lawsuit, and has confirmed reservations to return to the subject property on December 29, 2016, to avail himself of the goods and services offered to the public at the property. The Plaintiff has encountered architectural barriers at the subject property. The ADA violations and barriers to access at Sonesta ES Suites Somers Point are more specifically set forth in this Complaint. The barriers to access

- at the property have endangered his safety.
- 7. Defendant owns, leases, leases to, or operates a place of public accommodation as defined by the ADA and the regulations implementing the ADA, 28 CFR 36.201(a) and 36.104. Defendant is responsible for complying with the obligations of the ADA. The place of public accommodation that the Defendant owns, operates, leases or leases to is known as Sonesta ES Suites Somers Point, and is located at 900 Mays Landing Rd., Somers Point, NJ 08244.
- 8. Dennis Maurer has a realistic, credible, existing and continuing threat of discrimination from the Defendant's non-compliance with the ADA with respect to this property as described but not necessarily limited to the allegations in paragraph 10 of this complaint. Plaintiff has reasonable grounds to believe that he will continue to be subjected to discrimination in violation of the ADA by the Defendant. Dennis Maurer desires to visit the subject property not only to avail himself of the goods and services available at the property but to assure himself that this property is in compliance with the ADA so that he and others similarly situated will have full and equal enjoyment of the property without fear of discrimination.
- 9. The Defendant has discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying him access to, and full and equal enjoyment of, the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the buildings, as prohibited by 42 U.S.C. § 12182 et seq.
- 10. The Defendant has discriminated, and is continuing to discriminate, against the Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing to, inter alia, have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A preliminary inspection of the Sonesta ES Suites Somers Point has shown that violations exist. These violations that Dennis Maurer personally encountered or observed

include, but are not limited to:

### Parking and Exterior Accessible Route

- A. Sonesta ES Suites fails to provide a safe accessible route for those in wheelchairs at the Passenger Loading Zone, violating Section 503 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards. Mr. Maurer was unable to unload freely and safely from his vehicle to check-in.
- B. The exterior accessible route throughout Sonesta ES Suites is impeded by slopes at the base of the door and steps along the route, violating Section 404 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards.
- C. Plaintiff Dennis Maurer, as a guest of the hotel, was affected by a lack of compliant access aisles to unload from his vehicle, violating Section 502 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards.
- D. Curb ramps throughout the hotel are a hazard to those in wheelchairs and are not provided in all areas, violating Section 406 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards.
- E. Sonesta ES Suites fails to provide an accessible route to the adjacent sidewalk, violating Section 206.2.1 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards. Mr. Maurer could only leave the hotel by car due to the lack of a route to the sidewalk.

#### Access to Goods and Services

- F. Lowered counters for accessible use at check-in at Sonesta ES Suites are not provided, violating Section 904 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards. Mr. Maurer was impeded by a lack of reach range while accessing the desk.
- G. Sonesta ES Suites fails to provide desks with adequate knee clearance, violating Section 306 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards.
- H. Phones and other elements throughout Sonesta ES Suites are mounted beyond the reach of Mr. Maurer and those in wheelchairs, violating Section 308 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards.
- I. Water fountains are not accessible for those in wheelchairs at Sonesta ES Suites, violating Section 602 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards.

## Hotel Guestrooms and Restrooms

- J. Mr. Maurer requires a roll-in shower as a hotel guest of Sonesta ES Suites was unable to shower due to a lack of accessible roll-in showers, violating Section 608.2 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards.
- K. Desks in guestrooms fail to provide adequate knee clearance for those in wheelchairs, violating Section 306 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards.
- L. Sonesta ES Suites provides improper hardware and other essential elements lack accessibility in the guestrooms, violating the 2010 Accessibility Standards.
- M. Restrooms provided in the guestrooms and lobby are improperly designed and Mr. Maurer was unable to use the restroom freely and safely, violating Section 601 of the 2010 Accessibility Standards.
- 12. All of the foregoing violations are also violations of the 1991 Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG), and the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design, as promulgated by the U.S. Department of Justice.
- 13. The discriminatory violations described in paragraph 10 are not an exclusive list of the Defendant's ADA violations. Plaintiff requires the inspection of the Defendant's place of public accommodation in order to photograph and measure all of the discriminatory acts violating the ADA and all of the barriers to access. The individual Plaintiff, and all other individuals similarly situated, have been denied access to, and have been denied the benefits of services, programs and activities of the Defendant's buildings and its facilities, and have otherwise been discriminated against and damaged by the Defendant because of the Defendant's ADA violations, as set forth above. The individual Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein. In order to remedy this

- discriminatory situation, the Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Defendant's place of public accommodation in order to determine all of the areas of non-compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- 14. Defendant has discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying him access to full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of its place of public accommodation or commercial facility in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq. and 28 CFR 36.302 et seq. Furthermore, the Defendant continues to discriminate against the Plaintiff, and all those similarly situated by failing to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such efforts that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services.
- 15. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law and is suffering irreparable harm. Considering the balance of hardships between the Plaintiff and Defendant, a remedy in equity is warranted. Furthermore, the public interest would not be disserved by a permanent injunction. Plaintiff has retained the undersigned counsel and is entitled to recover attorney's fees, costs and litigation expenses from the Defendant pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205 and 28 CFR 36.505.
- 16. Defendant is required to remove the existing architectural barriers to the physically disabled when such removal is readily achievable for its place of public accommodation that have

existed prior to January 26, 1992, 28 CFR 36.304(a); in the alternative, if there has been an alteration to Defendant's place of public accommodation since January 26, 1992, then the Defendant is required to ensure to the maximum extent feasible, that the altered portions of the facility are readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals who use wheelchairs, 28 CFR 36.402; and finally, if the Defendant's facility is one which was designed and constructed for first occupancy subsequent to January 26, 1993, as defined in 28 CFR 36.401, then the Defendant's facility must be readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities as defined by the ADA.

- 17. Notice to Defendant is not required as a result of the Defendant's failure to cure the violations by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). All other conditions precedent have been met by Plaintiff or waived by the Defendant.
- 18. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188, this Court is provided with authority to grant Plaintiff Injunctive Relief, including an order to require the Defendant to alter the Sonesta ES Suites Somers Point to make its facilities readily accessible and useable to the Plaintiff and all other persons with disabilities as defined by the ADA; or by closing the facility until such time as the Defendant cures its violations of the ADA.

#### WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests:

- a. The Court issue a Declaratory Judgment that determines that the Defendant at the commencement of the subject lawsuit is in violation of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq.
- b. Injunctive relief against the Defendant including an order to make all readily

achievable alterations to the facility; or to make such facility readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA; and to require the Defendant to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such steps that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services.

- c. An award of attorney's fees, costs and litigation expenses pursuant to 42 U.S.C.
   § 12205.
- d. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper, and/or is allowable under

  Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

# COUNT II VIOLATION OF NEW JERSEY LAW AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

- 19. Plaintiff realleges all prior obligations as if fully set forth herein. Plaintiff repeats the allegations contained in all of the proceeding paragraphs.
- 20. Defendant's facility is a place of public accommodation as defined by N.J.S.A. 10:5-5, (New Jersey Law Against Discrimination).
- 21. New Jersey law provides that all persons shall have the opportunity to obtain all the accommodations, advantages, facilities and privileges of any place of public accommodation without discrimination on the basis of disability. This opportunity is recognized and declared

to be a civil right. (See, N.J.S.A. 10:5-4.)

22. As a result of the aforementioned discrimination, Plaintiff Dennis Maurer has sustained emotional distress, mental anguish and suffering and humiliation, and other injuries, in violation of the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination.

WHEREFORE, Dennis Maurer demands judgment for damages, attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, including expert fees and costs pursuant to the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination.

Respectfully Submitted,

Asaad K. Siddiqi, Esq. (AS-9150) Walder Hayden, P.A. 5 Becker Farm Rd. Roseland, NJ 07068 (973) 992-5300 aksiddiqi@walderhayden.com

> John P. Fuller, Esquire, pro hac vice pending Fuller, Fuller & Associates, P.A. 12000 Biscayne Blvd., Suite 502 North Miami, FL 33181 (305) 891-5199 (305) 893-9505 - Facsimile jpf@fullerfuller.com

By:

Asaad K. Siddiqi, Esq. (AS-9150

Date:

May 3, 2016

Counsel for Plaintiff Dennis Maurer

#4915-HPT IHG-2 Properties Trust Complaint Pkg (slm 4-7-16).wpd

JS 44 (Rev. 12/12)

## **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

purpose of initiating the civil	docker sheet. (BEB Will No.	CHORDONNELLITAGEOR	711111111111111111111111111111111111111							
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS DENNIS MAURER, Individually				DEFENDANTS HPT IHG-2 PROPERTIES TRUST, a Maryland Corporation						
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Atlantic, NJ  (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)  973-992-530  (c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, Email and Telephone Number)  Walder Hayden P.A. Asaad K. Siddiqi, Esq. 5 Becker Farm Rd.			Attorneys (If Known)							
Roseland, NJ 07068	aksiddiqi@w				DIVIGIDAL I	D. A. DOWNERG				
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X" in (	One Box Only)		FIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL I	AKTIES	Place an "X" in and One Box f			
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	<b>Ճ</b> 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government	t Not a Party)	,	P		orporated <i>or</i> Prio of Business In Tl	ncipal Place	PTF □ 4	DEF	
🗇 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizens)	hip of Partics in Item III)	Citizer	of Another State		orporated <i>and</i> Pr of Business In A		<b>5</b>	☐ 5	
				or Subject of a  ign Country	3 🗇 3 Fore	eign Nation		<b>6</b>	□ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT		ORTS	FOI	RFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRU	PICV	OTHER	STATUTI	FS	
110 Insurance   120 Marine   130 Miller Act   140 Negotiable Instrument   150 Recovery of Overpayment	□ 350 Motor Vehicle □ 355 Motor Vehicle □ 770 Other Fraud □ 371 Truth in Lendi □ 371 Truth in Lendi □ 370 Other Persona □ 780 Other Persona □ 380 Other Persona □ 380 Other Persona □ 780 Other Persona □ 780 Other Praud □ 780 Other P		710	Drig Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 Other  LABOR Fair Labor Standards Act Labor/Management Relations Railway Labor Act Family and Medical Leave Act Other Labor Litigation Employee Retirement Income Security Act	422 Appeal 28 USC 158   423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157   PROPERTY RIGHTS   820 Copyrights   830 Patent   840 Trademark   SOCIAL SECURITY   861 HIA (1395ff)   862 Black Lung (923)   863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)   864 SSID Title XVI   865 RSI (405(g))   FEDERAL TAX SUITS   870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)   871 IRS—Third Party		□ 375 False Claims Act □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and □ Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ □ Exchange □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 895 Freedom of Information □ Act □ 896 Arbitration □ 899 Administrative Procedure □ Act/Review or Appeal of □ Agency Decision □ 950 Constitutionality of			
<ul> <li>□ 240 Torts to Land</li> <li>□ 245 Tort Product Liability</li> <li>□ 290 All Other Real Property</li> </ul>	□ 443 Housing/     Accommodations     □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -     Employment      □ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities -     Other     □ 448 Education	Sentence    530 General   535 Death Penalty   Other:   540 Mandamus & Other   550 Civil Rights   555 Prison Condition   560 Civil Detainee -   Conditions of   Confinement	□ 465	IMMIGRATION Naturalization Application Other Immigration Actions	26 USC 7609		State Sta	itutes		
	noved from 3	Remanded from  Appellate Court	4 Reinsta Reopei		rred from	Multidistric Litigation	t			
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	N Brief description of ca			not cite jurisdictional statu	vision of the A	mericans v				
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS UNDER RULE 2	IS A CLASS ACTION 3, F.R.Cv.P.	DEN	MAND \$		X YES only if DEMAND:	demanded in o	complaint No	t;	
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NU	MBER				
DATE	-	SIGNATURE OF APPO	RNEY OF	RECORD						
5/3/2016 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		Many	Sid	ولي-	·					
•	OUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUDO	ŀΕ			